



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

09

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/642,642	08/19/2003	Dov Zipori	85189-4900	3766
28765 7590 09/12/2007 WINSTON & STRAWN LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			EXAMINER SKELDING, ZACHARY S	
			ART UNIT 1644	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/642,642	Applicant(s) ZIPORI ET AL.	
	Examiner Zachary Skelding	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election, with traverse, filed June 5, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claims 1-26 are pending.

2. Applicant traverses on the grounds that the inventions of Groups 1-38 should be rejoined and examined as one and that in searching these groups drawn to polynucleotides it would not be an undue burden to concurrently search Groups 39-74 and 115 drawn to polypeptides encoded by the polynucleotides of groups 1-38.

Applicant's argument has been considered but has not be found convincing, essentially for the reasons of record.

Accordingly, the restriction requirement mailed April 20, 2007 is made FINAL.

Nevertheless, upon further consideration the previous Restriction Requirement of April 20, 2007 is VACATED.

A new Restriction Requirement is set forth.

The Examiner apologizes for any inconvenience to Applicant in this matter.

Restriction Requirement

3. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

Group I. Claims 1-11, 13-15 and 17, drawn to polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J β sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J β joining region followed by a J β constant region, *encoding SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2, 17 respectively AND* polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J α sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J α joining region followed by a J α constant region, *encoding SEQ ID NOs: 3-16 and 18-36, respectively, AND* the SEQ ID NO: 38 polynucleotide, classified in Class 536, subclass 23.4.

Group II. Claims 18 and 19, drawn to synthetic peptides selected from *SEQ ID NOs: 1-36*, classified in Class 530, subclass 300.

Group III. Claims 20 and 21, drawn to an antibody raised against synthetic peptides selected from *SEQ ID NOs: 1-36*, classified in Class 530, subclass 387.1.

Group IV. Claims 22 and 23, drawn to a method for inducing mesenchymal cell growth comprising administering a polynucleotide according to claim 1, classified in Class 435, subclass 377.

Art Unit: 1644

Group V. Claims 24 and 25, drawn to a method for suppressing mesenchymal cell growth comprising administering transected mesenchymal human cells comprising an antisense DNA according to claim 12, classified in Class 435, subclass 375.

Group VI. Claim 26, drawn to a method of marking mesenchymal cells comprising applying an antibody according to claim 20, classified in Class 435, subclass 7.1.

Group VII. Claim 12, drawn to an antisense polynucleotide of the polynucleotides of claim 1, classified in Class 536, subclass 24.3.

Group VIII. Claim 16, drawn to a polypeptide encoded by the polynucleotides of claim 1, classified in Class 530, subclass 350.

4. The inventions of Groups I-III, VII and VIII are different products. The products are patentably distinct because their structures, physicochemical properties and/or mode of action are different, and they do not share a common structure that is disclosed to be essential for common utility. Furthermore, they require non-coextensive searches in the scientific literature. Therefore, each product is patentably distinct, and searching of these Inventions would impose an undue burden.
5. The inventions of Groups IV-VI are drawn to different methods, which differ with respect to one or more ingredients, method steps, and/or endpoints; therefore, each method is patentably distinct. Further, the distinct ingredients, method steps, and/or endpoints require separate and distinct searches. As such, it would be burdensome to search these inventions together.
6. The inventions of Groups VII and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the invention of Group V can be practiced with a materially different product, such as an antibody to platelet derived growth factor.
7. The inventions of Groups III and VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the invention of Group VI can be practiced with a materially different product, such as an antibody against the mesenchymal cell surface protein SB-10.

Art Unit: 1644

8. The inventions of Groups I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the invention of Group 111 can be practiced with a materially different product, such as platelet derived growth factor.

Election of Species

9. Should applicant elect any one of groups I, IV, VII or VIII for examination then applicant is required to elect a species as follows:

Claims 1, 6, 13-15, 12, 16, 22 and 23 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species: "polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J β sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J β joining region followed by a J β constant region" **AND** "polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J α sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J α joining region followed by a J α constant region" **AND** SEQ ID NO: 38.

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Furthermore, should applicant elect "polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J β sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J β joining region followed by a J β constant region" as the species to be examined, then applicant should further elect a particular "intronic J β sequence" selected from SEQ ID NOs: 1, 2 or 17.

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Furthermore, should applicant elect “polynucleotides comprising a transcript from a T cell receptor gene wherein the transcript comprises an intronic J α sequence with an in frame methionine followed by a J α joining region followed by a J α constant region” as the species to be examined, then applicant should further elect a particular “intronic J α sequence” selected from SEQ ID NOs: 3-16 and 18-36.

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

10. Should applicant elect any one of Groups II, III, V or VI for examination then applicant is required to elect a species as follows:

Claims 18-21 and 24-26 are generic to the following disclosed patentably distinct species:
SEQ ID Nos: 1-36.

The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

11. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.**

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

12. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:
- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
 - (b) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
 - (c) the inventions require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);

Art Unit: 1644

(d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;

(e) the inventions are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

13. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply

Art Unit: 1644

where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary Skelding whose telephone number is 571-272-9033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Zachary Skelding, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
August 23, 2007



MICHAIL BELYAVSKYI, PH.D.
PATENT EXAMINER

001 23/07